

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein requested.

Claims 1 through 21 stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, and 13 are being amended, and claims 6 and 7 are being cancelled. Accordingly, after entering this amendment, claims 1 through 5 and 8 through 21 remain pending.

Further Clarification of the Claims

Prior to discussing the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that a brief discussion on the current form of the claims of this application is warranted. Claims 4 and 13 have been amended to correct minor grammatical errors, and the sole independent claim (claim 1) has been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the subject matter of the present invention. As amended, claim 1 now requires that a *single* sensor, and hence a single accelerometer, is mounted on a respective "B" post on opposite sides of the vehicle at a first longitudinal position. The sensing axes of the accelerometers are mirror symmetrical to each other, so that a predetermined angle of the sensing axis of one of the accelerometers is between 30° and 60°, while the predetermined angle of the sensing axis of the other accelerometer on the opposite side of the vehicle is between -30° and -60°.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,892 issued to Kiribayashi et al. ("Kiribayashi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Kiribayashi shows in various embodiments a triggering device for a safety apparatus with a sensor unit located on the left-hand side of a vehicle and a sensor unit located on the right-hand side of the vehicle. In certain embodiments, each of Kiribayashi's sensor units includes a respective pair of acceleration sensors, that is, there are *two* accelerometers on the left hand side of the vehicle and two accelerometers on the right hand side of the vehicle at a first longitudinal position. In other embodiments, Kiribayashi describes arrangements of the triggering device with one accelerometer on each side of the vehicle. In these arrangements, however, Kiribayashi does not show or describe a single sensor with a single accelerometer being mounted on respective "B" posts on opposite sides of the vehicle at a first longitudinal position and having sensing axes that are mirror symmetrical to each other so that a predetermined angle of the sensing axis of one of the accelerometers is between 30° and 60°, while the predetermined angle of the sensing axis of the other accelerometer on the opposite side of the vehicle is between -30° and -60°.

Accordingly, Kiribayashi teaches away from a crash sensor arrangement with *only* two sensors, each sensor including a single accelerometer, and each sensor, and hence each accelerometer, being mounted on respective "B" posts on opposite sides of a vehicle at a first longitudinal position and having sensing axes that are mirror symmetrical to each other, such that a predetermined angle of the sensing axis of one of the accelerometers is between 30° and 60°, while the predetermined angle of the sensing axis of the other accelerometer on the opposite side of the vehicle is between -30° and -60°, as now required by amended claim 1. Since Kiribayashi does not teach each and every element now recited in amended claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be accordingly withdrawn.

Further, since claims 2 through 5 and 8 through 21 depend from claim 1, directly or indirectly, the reasons for allowance of claim 1 apply to the dependent claims as well. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 of claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims (claims 1 through 5 and 8 through 21) are distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for the Applicant if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,

August 7, 2009

Date

/John M. Card/

John M. Card (Reg. No. 48,423)

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
524 South Main Street
Suite 200
Ann Arbor, MI 48104